

fever like rash appearing two days after the serum was discontinued, no deleterious symptoms were noticed from the large dose. The nurses reported that after every dose of antitoxin the heart was decidedly stimulated. Dr. Reynolds, who had charge of the diphtheria end of the case, and myself, take this occasion to thank Drs. Adams, Moore and Krone for their gratuitous services, as the patient certainly owes part of her life to their advice, and also to the Cutter Laboratory, who furnished all the serum, letting Dr. Reynolds use all he thought necessary even if they were not paid at all.

The largest record dose of antitoxin I am able to obtain is 280,000 or 287,000 units, which the Cutter people say a patient in one of the eastern cities received.

Mrs. R. received 555,000 units of diphtheria antitoxin.

W. LEWIS EMERSON,
Secretary.

PUBLICATIONS

An Aid to Materia Medica. By Robert H. M. Dabarn, M. D., Professor of Surgery and of Surgical Anatomy, New York Polyclinic Medical School; Professor of Surgery, Fordham Medical College, New York; Visiting Surgeon to the City Hospital, New York. Fourth Edition, Revised and Enlarged. By Eden V. Delphey, M. D. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1908.

So well known is the excellence of the previous reprints of this book that the present edition calls for little comment by the reviewer. The changes in the Pharmacopeia of the Eighth Decennial Revision have made necessary greater or less changes in the text, but as formerly the aim has been to present in brief space and tabular form all the drugs and preparations recognized by the Pharmacopeia, with their doses, composition, strength, synonyms, pronunciation, and in the case of drugs of vegetable origin the derivation and habitat. Other helpful features found in the previous editions, such as rules for the dosage of medicines in childhood, the chapter on prescription writing, dangerous abbreviations in prescription writing, the article on incompatibility, etc., have been retained.

For students, the volume will doubtless prove useful since examiners require much that the practitioner soon lays aside; for graduates it may serve as a ready reference book. Whilst our present conditions certainly create a want for works of this character the reviewer feels with Dr. Delphey, who has assumed the responsibilities of the present revision that "it would be the part of wisdom for physicians to drop many (drugs) which they are now using, to get thoroughly acquainted with a few drugs and not change to a new or much lauded drug until he finds an indication which the old fails to meet."

A. J. L.

Neurographs. A Series of Neurological Studies, Cases, and Notes. Editor, William Browning, Ph. B., M. D., Vol. I, No. 2.

We called attention to the first number of this publication at the time of its appearance in a note which was unfortunately so marred by misprints that whatever notice it may have obtained was very likely bestowed rather on those errors in the printing than on the enterprise on which it was our intention to animadvert. We therefore believe that we are doing no more than our duty in again seeking to call attention to Neurographs, now that a second number has been issued.

This number is devoted wholly to Huntington's career and Huntington's Chorea. Huntington's Chorea, it will be remembered, was first described from cases occurring in Long Island, and Long

Island is the home of Neurographs. The number before us is adorned with portraits of Dr. Huntington, contains a number of articles on the history of Huntington's Chorea, one of them by Professor Osler, an article on the disease in German by Professor V. Strumpell and one in French by Lannois and Paviot, together with much other material bearing on the subject, and concludes with a valuable biography. This issue of Neurographs refreshes by its exhibition of scientific enthusiasm and excites sympathy for its healthy local pride. L. N.

A CRITICISM OF VALUE (?).

The following communication has been received for publication and is here given exactly as received for the reason that it shows so clearly the chaotic cerebrations of the majority of the "kickers." It seems unnecessary to comment on the originality displayed in spelling, grammar, etc.:

Los Angeles Cal. June 12 1908.

California State Medical Journal
San Francisco
Cal.

Is the California State Medical Law Unjust?

Every question is debatable from two sides and every law is considered from two view points; so therefore it depends materially upon which side we may happen to be looking, whether we can see with clear vision or not.

I am trying to look at the State law in reference to Medical applicants for licenses as a once time outsider; (i. e.) outside of the pale of the sanctum sanctorum of the Medical laws or fraternity of the State of California, but now able to look over the fence from the inside.

To begin with, I am not one who do not believe in State laws, for I do but that those laws be just laws, laws that do not work a hardship upon any honorable man in the profession; in fact I am a believer in a National Board of Examiners, & believe it to be consistent for a man who is competent of practicing in one state to be equally competent to do so in another, having faith in the profession, I believe the day is not far distant when we will have a National board, or its equivalent in a reciprocity law, wherein a licensiate by examination will be registered in any state in the union, but until that time & while the California State Board continues its policy of closed doors against competent men, I believe they should modify the law in one respect at least and that is in regards to the necessary requirements for a certificate.

So far as the School requirements are concerned, I believe in keeping the standard here as high as anywhere, but the clause that says, first that a general average of 75% must be made & that for longevity applicants there will be granted five % on there general average for the first & every ten years of active practice thereafter & then deliberately making this clause retroactive or invalid by a following clause stating that the applicant must make not less than 60% in any one branch or subject & if he does so shall fail, I contend is unfair.

Some men who have practiced 10—20— or even 35 years, who have a credit from active practice of from 5 to 15 % no matter whether they make the required 75 % and fall below 60% in any one branch must needs be re-examined & pay another fee.

Of course the majority of men formulating the State laws are men who have never had to take state board examinations, & possibly would not be as competent, as many a man whom their law turns down, and it is all well & good for them to say we must uphold the law & so say I. But eliminate that clause & give them a fair deal, for it would be comparatively easy for men long in the practice of medicine, to pass the state board of examination if they were granted 5 to 15 % as the case may be & it

were applied to there general average, but it is almost impossible for many to do so, if the requirements of 60 % in each branch is insisted upon.

DR. H. G. M.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

The following appeal, issued by the Journal of the South Carolina Association, is sound. Will the members of our California Society follow the excellent suggestion?

To the Owners of this Journal, the Members of the South Carolina Medical Association:

You know that reciprocity encourages business, don't you? Outside of common decency, and leaving aside mere etiquette, it's good business to stick to your friends, isn't it? Now, who is your friend—the smooth-tongued spiel-artist who swears undying love and admiration for you as long as he is in your hearing, and laughs behind your back at your ease gullibility and willingness to do business with him at an expense to himself of nothing more than a few lungfuls of hot air? Or is your friend the fellow who thinks enough of you to support your efforts for betterment and puts up his fair share of cash for the promotion of straightforward business intercourse with you and for the stimulation of legitimate professional business and its accompanying trade?

The last, you say? Certainly. There are no hopeless idiots among the owners of this Journal.

All right; so far, so good. But what are you doing for your friends who are helping you in your work? And what will you do for the pretenders who are "working" you for their own help?

Read the following colloquy, which actually occurred very recently in our hearing:

Affable Salesman, entering Doctor's office: "Doctor, I am representing the Blank and Blank Laboratories, of Analaska, and I have a very elegant preparation, of which I am going to leave you samples, of the best, positively the very best, most scientific mixture of laxative salts ever offered to your discriminating profession. This is—"

Doctor, interrupting: "Does your firm advertise in the Journal of our State Medical Association?"

Salesman, with feigned pained surprise: "Er—no. Why do you ask?"

Doctor, cheerfully: "Oh, because there's really no reason why we doctors should support a firm that is not willing and ready to support us in our efforts to better existing conditions."

Salesman, affecting indignation: "Do you mean to tell me, sir, that simply because a firm does not advertise in your Journal, you refuse to consider or test its products, no matter how superior they may be—no matter how many lives they may save?"

Doctor, sweetly: "My dear man, how many firms in this country put out the best product on the market? And how many of them come in here to tell me all about it? Do you suppose for a minute that I, or any other doctor, have time to try them all on their merits? Do you now, eh?"

Salesman, unwillingly: "Well, no, I don't suppose you have."

Doctor: "Very good. Then isn't it reasonable and proper that what testing and patronage we have to place should favor first the firms that maintain close business relations with us—our business friends?"

Salesman: "Yes, I guess that's true. I am going to take this matter up with the house. What's the Journal's business address?"

Now, the point is that the Journal needs the support of good ethical advertisers, and if every doctor who is part owner of the Journal will pursue the above line of thought, speech and action the effect would be magical. As long as these houses think

they can work us without advertising, they will hold back. It is up to us, every one of us, to treat them as if they were from Missouri, and show them! By doing this we are at the same time giving loyal support to those houses that are represented in our pages, which is only decent and proper. They are the ones to whom we should always give preference, and we again urge all of our joint owners to follow up this principle and always to insist distinctly when buying supplies that you wish and will have our advertisers' products—there are none better.

We have a most wonderful and estimable concord of thought in the profession of our State. What remains to be acquired is unity of action. Are there brains and energy enough in our membership to accomplish it? We think so.

This is practical, hard-sense talk, and we appeal to every individual member for active, intelligent co-operation.

Faithfully,
YOUR JOURNAL.

THE SAMUEL D. GROSS PRIZE—FIFTEEN HUNDRED DOLLARS.

The conditions annexed by the testator are that the prize "shall be awarded every five years to the writer of the best original essay, not exceeding one hundred and fifty pages, octavo, in length, illustrative of some subject in surgical pathology or surgical practice, founded upon original investigations, the candidates for the prize to be American citizens."

It is expressly stipulated that the competitor who receives the prize, shall publish his essay in book form, and that he shall deposit one copy of the work in the Samuel D. Gross Library of the Philadelphia Academy of Surgery, and that on the title page, it shall be stated that the essay was awarded the Samuel D. Gross prize of the Philadelphia Academy of Surgery.

The essays, which must be written by a single author in the English language, should be sent to the "Trustees of the Samuel D. Gross Prize of the Philadelphia Academy of Surgery, care of the College of Physicians, 219 S. 13th St., Philadelphia," on or before January 1, 1910.

Each essay must be typewritten, distinguished by a motto, and accompanied by a sealed envelope bearing the same motto, containing the name and address of the writer. No envelope will be opened except that which accompanies the successful essay.

The committee will return the unsuccessful essays if reclaimed by their respective writers, or their agents, within one year.

The committee reserves the right to make no award if the essays submitted are not considered worthy of the prize.

WILLIAM J. TAYLOR, M. D.
RICHARD H. HARTE, M. D.,
DE FOREST WILLARD, M. D.,
Trustees.

Philadelphia, June 15th, 1908.

THE FIRE INSURANCE COMPANIES AND THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE.

A statement endorsed by the San Francisco County Medical Society.

We, as physicians of San Francisco and members of the San Francisco County Medical Society, wish to express our gratitude to those fire insurance companies that quickly adjusted their losses after the great fire and conveyed prompt relief to those who trusted them.

It is now more than two years since that greatest of all fires, and we feel that time enough has elapsed to permit a just view of the situation. The professional classes, such as lawyers, doctors and dentists, were particularly hard hit, as their offices were in the heart of the city. During those awful days no